



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,969	01/27/2000	Ronald Spangler	ACX-128	9298

21323            7590            04/03/2002

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP  
HIGH STREET TOWER  
125 HIGH STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

TRINH, MINH N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/491,969	SPANGLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Minh Trinh	3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-23, 25-27, 30-32, 36 and 37 drawn to a vibration control system, classified in class 29, subclass 740.
  - II. Claims 28, 38 and 39, drawn to a vibration control system, classified in class 355.
  - III. Claim 29, drawn to a vibration control system, classified in class 356
  - IV. Claims 24 and 33-35, drawn to method of controlling a vibration in a gantry, classified in class 29, subclass 832.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, Group I invention as claimed, does not require the particulars of Group II, as claimed, because Group I invention does not require a sensor for detecting at least one parameter of displacement of a unitary part of the fabricating system (cited in claim 28, lines 4-5). The subcombination has separate utility such as detecting a number parameter of displacement of unitary parts.

3. Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. In the instant case, Group I invention as claimed does not require the particulars of Group II as claimed because Group I invention does not require a sensor for detecting a signal from the motor(cited in claim 29, line 4). The subcombination has separate utility such as a sensor for detecting a signal of a motor.

4. Inventions I and IV are related as Vibration control system and process of controlling vibration. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the step of bonding process as claimed (claim 24, lines 3-6) can be done by hand.

5. Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as a sensor is used for purpose of detecting the signal from a motor instead of detecting one displacement of a unitary part of the fabricating system as claimed by Group II. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

6. Inventions II and IV are related as Vibration control system and process of controlling vibration. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the

Art Unit: 3729

process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the step of bonding as claimed (claim 24, lines 3-6), which can be done by hand or by other apparatus.

7. Inventions III and IV are related as Vibration control system and process of controlling vibration. In this case, the step of bonding can be done by means other than recites by applicant in claim 24.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above have acquired classifications, and the searches of the groups are divergent, restriction for examination purposes is proper.

9. If applicant elects the invention of *Group I*, restriction to one of the following is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

In Group I of the invention, the following species are exist:

*Species 1A*- drawn to one embodiment (discussed at page 3, lines 1-20).

*1B*- drawn to preferred embodiment (pg 3, Ins 22 to pg 4, In 6).

*1C*- drawn to another preferred embodiment ( pg 4, Ins 7-12).

*1D*- drawn to yet another preferred embodiment (pg 4, Ins 13+).

Art Unit: 3729

10. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

11. A telephone call was made to Jennifer A. Camacho (reg. 43,526) on 3/28/2002 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

12. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-2887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7307 for regular communications and (703) 305-3579 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3729

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

mt  
April 2, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "PETER VO", is written over a horizontal line. The line starts at the left edge of the page and extends towards the right, ending under the signature.

PETER VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700